

To: Montgomery, Michael[Montgomery.Michael@epa.gov]; Albright, David[Albright.David@epa.gov]
From: Skadowski, Suzanne
Sent: Tue 1/27/2015 10:12:42 PM
Subject: FW: a couple of data questions from the San Francisco Chronicle re UICs

Mike and David,

Per my phone call & vm a few minutes ago. Just got off the phone again with David at the SF Chronicle. Below is the main discrepancy he wants to clear up. He is convinced that DOGGR sent him a different spreadsheet than the one we have since his list does not have any wells >10,000. This clearly bothers him. In any case, can we address this issue below by email or by phone, or not at all?

Suzanne Skadowski
Public Affairs Specialist
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency | San Francisco
D: 415-972-3165| **C:** 415-265-2863| **E:** skadowski.suzanne@epa.gov

From: Baker, David [mailto:DBaker@sfchronicle.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2015 2:08 PM
To: Skadowski, Suzanne
Subject: FW: a couple of data questions from the San Francisco Chronicle
Importance: High

These are from Don Drysdale, spokesman for DOGGR.

1. The list of 532 wells was queried from the database last August. The list of 108 wells injecting into the 11 aquifers was queried more recently. Of those 108 wells, 94 are on the 532 list. The 14 wells not in that list are either:
 - a. Injecting or proposed to inject into non-USDWs (TDS

>10,000 based on latest information), hence the question of exemption is moot.

b. Not disposal wells – the 532 list were all disposal wells. The 108 list included enhanced oil recovery wells also.

c. Permits held in abeyance or cancelled. Some well statuses have not been updated yet, which is why these still turned up in the recent query of 108 wells.

2. DOGGR submitted an initial list of 147 wells injecting into sub-3,000 TDS aquifers to the Water Board.